

In 1895, just before the assembling of the South Carolina Constitutional convention, Major L. T. Izlar, then a citizen of Blackville, S. C., now a citizen of Ocala, printed the following article in the Charleston News and Courier, and the most of his suggestions are still appropos:

To the Editor News and Courier:

The editorial in today's issue of your valued paper on the subject of a court of summary jurisdiction suggests to me the propriety of placing before the public, and especially the delegates chosen to compose the constitutional convention, some thoughts along that line which I have for some time been revolving in my own mind.

Every good and thoughtful citizen of the state must deplore that spirit of lawlessness which too frequently manifests itself in every section of our state by mobs taking the law in their own hands and administering summary punishment upon criminals. In some instances it is to be feared that the mobs are not too exacting as to the evidence upon which they act, and the innocent suffer for the deeds of the guilty. In no civilized community where fixed and settled laws are of force for the punishment of crime can mob law be justified. There may be, and doubtless are, occasions where the crime is so heinous and the details of it so horrible and revolting that summary punishment by the people in their heat and indignation may be palliated and excused, but from a legal standpoint never justified. The inevitable tendency of every such occurrence is to lower the standard of civilization and to bring law and order into disrepute.

Every time a lynching takes place it is an object lesson to all the world that our own lives, liberty and property are less secure than ever before. It is within the memory of all men of mature age when lynching was resorted to for only one crime, but it is not so now. The spirit of lawlessness, and the fact that the mobs go unpunished have added crime after crime to Judge Lynch's calendar, and if some remedy is not found his jurisdiction will soon extend to the chicken and melon thief. It is subversive of the morals of the rising generation and detrimental to the material welfare and progress of our state. Such being the case, mobocracy should be abated. To apply the remedy it is first necessary to find the cause or causes which lead the people to violate the law and administer punishment by their own hands.

I think there can be no doubt that it is largely traceable to the tardiness of meting out justice through the machinery of the courts. The people have seen too many criminals escape just punishment whose cases were passed through the regular form of trial in the courts. It is too easy, strictly too much within the established rules of law and practice, to continue a case from term to term, and thus, in the meantime, human nature will largely transfer the sympathy from the slain or injured party to the prisoner. When at last a trial is reached if a conviction follows, an appeal is taken to the supreme court on some trifling technicality, yet a rule of law which that court must observe, although it had no weight whatever with the jury in reaching the verdict, results in the case being sent back for a new trial. This brings about another trial after a still longer lapse of time, and then if a second conviction follows there is a motion for a new trial on after-discovered evidence and possibly another appeal. Thus delay follows delay, until finally the prisoner is set free, although rightfully convicted by the jury which first tried the case.

In seven cases out of ten the party charged with the crime has been on bail, disposing of his time and person as suits his convenience and inclination, and of course taking every step possible to secure his acquittal. If, perchance, a final conviction is had, then petitions for executive clemency are freely circulated, and too readily signed, urging the governor to commute or pardon. With all of these agencies and influences at work it is too often the result that the grossly violated law is not vindicated, and the people are led to believe that if outrageous crimes are to be punished it must be done by the people, but outside of the legal channel.

Now, if these be some of the causes which lead to mob violence, and I believe they are, then it must follow that any measure which will remove those, or any of them, will lessen the inclination of the people to punish crime by mob violence. How then can this be done?

I suggest the following:

First, let the new constitution provide for the election of a judge at large in addition to a judge for each judicial circuit. Let this judge at large be subject to the to the order of the chief justice, whose duty it shall be to order the judge at large to any point in the state where any crime is committed which is of such a nature as to threaten mob violence. Let

The New York Times, which set out in the campaign but just begun to blacklist the democrats, has been driven into something like fairer play by the wider and wiser policy of its local newspaper competitors.

It thinks to recoup itself by a system of half-truths, designed generally to muddle the discussion; that is, to misrepresent Bryan and make for Taft. The Sun does this in its own sardonic way. It is amusing, but not impressive. The Times affects the tone of the reformer, being nothing if not a mugwump, and employs the language of complacency. The Sun is professionally sinister. The Times is rhetorically pompous and tricky. It concedes all that an intelligent patriotism may say against the republican party and all that an intelligent republicanism may say against Theodore Roosevelt, and, having established an unanswerable case for the democrats, proceeds calmly to urge its readers to vote for Taft.

The pretext for an attitude so specious and shallow, so inconsistent and illogical, is Bryan. The democratic nominee arraigns the republicans upon their monstrous tariff. The Times admits the force of all he says, and adds: "It is too bad that the tariff is not an issue in this campaign. If it were an issue, Mr. Bryan's speech would have some effect. But Mr. Bryan himself is the issue, and with whatever eloquence he may denounce Dingleyism and protection, the people have their eyes on him and will not take them off." So with every other arraignment of republican misrule made by Mr. Bryan. "It is useless," says the Times, with a lofty wave of the hand, all unconscious of its absurdity; for if Taft be not Roosevelt he is a fraud, but if he is Roosevelt the Times is left to choose between being a bigot and a cheat.

Argument with a spirit so perverse is out of the question, and I take it for a text only because, having the accumulated prejudices of twelve years to support its false assumptions, it is well aimed and timed to mislead the unthinking and unsuspecting. My single purpose is some revision of the experience of those twelve years. I am, as it were, a missionary of truth in these eastern wilds, and given the opportunity to be heard, I do not mean to go back to God's country until I have said my say. It may not be amiss to add that I receive not a penny of compensation, and that there is no office the acceptance of which I would so much as consider.

During ten years, from 1896 to 1906, no one rejected Mr. Bryan for a leader more resolutely than myself. If I could finally reach him and accept him, any good democrat can. It may help the yet undecided if I relate how I did.

In the early part of 1907 I proposed a parley having for its purpose some agreement among the Bryan men and the anti-Bryan men touching a presidential nominee other than Mr. Bryan. During ten months this encountered from the anti-Bryan men either indifference or detraction. I got no second to my motion. Emulating the frontier presiding officer who said, "Second your own motion, you son of a gun," they would have none of it. So I went to Florida, leaving them to go to thunder, or words to that effect, and the entire winter passed, the nomination of Mr. Bryan being either accepted or silently conceded by every public man suggested as an alternative. Finally, in the early spring two facts, sufficiently ascertained to

a court be then and there opened and the party charged with the crime tried. If the party is convicted and an appeal is taken to the supreme court let the time for the preparing of the appeal be limited to twenty days, and at the end of that time let it be the duty of the chief justice to call the supreme court together to hear the appeal and file the decision within ten days. Let the general assembly be authorized and empowered to enact such laws as may be necessary to organizing juries and prescribing rules of practice in these emergency courts.

I know that this plan is open to the objection of the probability of having juries composed of the people who were already aroused and angered, but this might in a measure be overcome by legislative enactments as to the qualifications of jurors for the emergency courts. Under any circumstances it would be far better than mob law. Many innocent victims might be saved, and a respect for the regular orderly methods of the law largely restored. This judge at large could, when not engaged in holding emergency courts, take the place of any circuit judge who might be sick or otherwise prevented from holding his courts. He could also hold extra

be conclusive, decided me; first, that an overwhelming majority of the democrats of the south and west were for Mr. Bryan, in spite of the argument I had made against his availability as a candidate; and, second, that the belated movement to defeat his nomination appeared under equivocal patronage and involved the use of money which emanated from doubtful sources. The latter, boding party disruption, impelled me actively to take a hand, urging a refusal to remain silent whilst a scheme, dangerous and unworthy in character, percolated beneath the surface. The result was a friendly conference with Mr. Bryan.

Intelligent people will not need to be told that there is all the difference in the world between sympathy and agreement—though tentative—and opposition and antagonism, though resting upon questions only of expediency. There was, of course, a reverse side of the shield. Mr. Bryan had his story to tell, and this embraced a very strong case. What authorization had he to name a successor in case he stepped aside? What power had he, conceding the will, to transfer his following to another? Not one, but half a dozen, aspirants would take the field immediately on his withdrawal. If a majority of the party was for him, what had made it so? Surely, neither organization, nor money, nor other effort of his than the constant preaching of democratic gospels. If he agreed to step down and out, designating an heir apparent, would he not become a dictator, an autocrat, and what difference would there be in his naming a successor, and attempting to foist upon him the party, and Roosevelt's naming and forcing Taft upon the republicans? He did not stand upon his rights at all, upon his claims, upon his wishes or ambitions. He put the facts of the situation plainly, impersonally, precisely as they were and are, and there was no reasonable answer to be made by any reasonable man.

Then and there I laid down my hand. As a good democrat, seeing clearly, and as the sequel has shown, seeing truly, the drift of the winds, I accepted the inevitable; but I did this in no dubious way. I make not half friendships with any man, nor set of men. There had never been anything more than skin deep between myself and Mr. Bryan. Nothing even skin deep remained, and, when the interview had in New York was concluded, I went forth to fall back upon the old line of battle and to take up again the order of march where it had been interrupted in 1896.

The anti-Bryan habit is self-deceptive. It is a pure delusion, where not a form, often an unconscious form, of infidelity to both duty and truth. Is it not the part of wisdom and justice—and is it not time—that those democrats who have consistently opposed him should look into the whys and wherefores with the purpose of reviewing the past, of revising the present and of casting some kind of balance sheet upon the ledger of their opinions and conduct?

We need not enter upon any course of crimination and recrimination. Whatever free silver was, or was not, as an economic issue, it is no longer here to divide us. Those who contended for it, led by Mr. Bryan—right or wrong as to the fiscal proposition—thought they were fighting for the masses against the classes, for the people against the prerogative, and against the same old Money Devil we had all fought under the leadership of Mr. Tilden and Mr. Cleveland. That question out of the way, what is there

or special sessions where the dockets were crowded.

Second, let the judges be more cautious in granting bail.

Third, let the people be more careful in signing petitions for executive clemency, and the governor closely examine all sides of every application, and unless there be some good, legal reason, let the sentence of the court be carried out.

If these suggestions are acted upon it will, in my opinion, be a long step towards suppressing mob violence and restoring proper respect for law and the courts. I have mentioned the plan to a number of persons, judges included among them, and all have concurred that the plan was a good one and worthy of being put into operation.

LAURIE T. IZLAR.
Blackville, S. C., July 30, 1895.

A COSTLY PICNIC

While the majority of the members of the New Orleans fire department were at a picnic fire broke out in the wholesale business district. Before a sufficient force had been assembled to fight the flames three blocks were swept and the loss is estimated at between \$1,000,000 and \$2,000,000.

THE PROGRESS OF THE CAMPAIGN

The Brilliant Editor of the Louisville Courier - Journal Writes a Characteristically Interesting Letter.

now to divide us? Nothing upon the face of the contention except the personality of Mr. Bryan. "Having been twice beaten, he can never be elected," says Sir Oracle. "Having been twice beaten he can never be elected," says Sir Oracle. "Having been twice beaten, he can never be elected," echo unthinking democrats. Yet it is this twice beaten candidate whom the rank and file of democracy cling to, and whom republican leaders and newspapers most savagely abuse. Why? In my opinion it is because there is in the people a discerning instinct and in Mr. Bryan a reflecting spirit which make for mutual trustfulness.

Mr. Bryan, upon acquaintance, proved different from my preconception of him. I met not a visionary orator but a man of sense, in deadly earnest, direct and candid. Coming to know him better, seeing him in his home, I found a man able and sincere, devoted and devout, having a childlike faith in the people, in God and truth. I changed my opinion altogether. I felt that I had done him injustice. I would as soon trust him in the White House as George Gray or Richard Olney; and I believe that when he gets there militant democracy of the school of Jefferson and Jackson and Tilden will renew its youth and vigor, leading the way to such reforms in the national house and senate as will restore them their legislative functions and give the people assurance of real and lasting good.

No party was ever known to reform itself. Republican promises to reform republican abuses make but a poor deathbed repentance. Taft means either "four years more of Theodore" or a new lease for Aldrich, Cannon and Company. Bryan means, if nothing else, the new broom that sweepeth clean, upon floors that are admittedly foul. There must be an occasional change of parties if we are to have decent administration. One-party government is only a degree less objectionable than the one-man power.

It is a peculiar misfortune and an augury of evil that the people of the east—notably the people of New York—get their mental sustenance chiefly through the organs of the rich. In the bucolic days "befo' the war," the people of the gulf states were fed from the same trough. Their newspapers sang only the virtues of slavery. None others were allowed to exist. In the fabulous wealth of the east piled up in a few hands—some of it predatory—much of it sprung from class legislation—all of it more or less corrupting—it is easy to detect a growing likeness to the patricianism of the old south.

Already artificial conditions of life predominate. Young men are reared to regard enthusiasm as effeminate. Young women are almost as educated in a knowledge of evil as young men. The sex line becomes less and less visible. Moral confusion makes political obliquity. Caste distinctions press upon the commonality more and more, and harder and harder. The foolish poor either hate or emulate the foolish rich. Graft is everywhere. Money-making seems to have swamped simple patriotism and popular ideas. The newspapers are so used to this that they grow callous—they take their complexion from society, which is well pleased with itself and wants things to remain as they are—a dissonant note denounced as the ignorance of an outsider, or the outcropping of anarchism. It was just so in the Carolinas fifty years ago. He who did not shout for slavery was an

abolitionist.

The worst of it is that the rich are over-ready to make common cause with the predatory rich. They do not discriminate. Mr. Roosevelt has gone much farther in socialistic extremism than Mr. Bryan ever went. Yet those who abuse the president—denouncing Bryan as a socialist—do not so characterize Roosevelt; and they will vote for Taft because they think that, Teddy Bear stowed safely away in the wilds of Africa, "Big Bill" and "Sunny Jim," with Aldrich in the senate and Cannon in the house, will soon have the elephant where they want him; the truth being that, for all the chatter about trustism and rebates, a spectacular fine, which will never be collected, remains the single trophy.

Two or three years ago the country stood aghast before the exposures precipitated by the insurance scandals, and all good men were vowing that they would not stop until the Augean stables should be cleaned. The traction scandals followed. Not a method has been altered. Not a culprit is in jail. But the "business of the country" requires that there shall be no further agitation, and in order to secure peace and quiet we must elect Taft, who swears by Roosevelt, and Sherman, who swears by Roosevelt, each of them finding him "a good enough Morgan until after the election." Is this anything other than perfidy and dishonor, and, if it should succeed, will not the conditions to be ultimately reformed be so grievous as to transcend the agencies of statesmen, and to become the sport and prey of the mob? Is not, for example, the other end of protectionism anarchy? Once upon a time we had a famous governor of Kentucky, old Charles Scott, the Indian fighter, who used to say that when things grow bad they are hard to mend, but that "when they get damned bad they just cut loose and mend themselves."

Mr. Bryan has suffered from over-praise as much as from over-abuse. Yet never an abusive word that is said of Mr. Bryan but was said of Mr. Jefferson. One need only turn back to the republican newspapers of 1876 to learn what a peril to patriotism and property Mr. Tilden was. No honest interest has any more to fear from the democratic party today, led by Mr. Bryan, than it had to fear when the party was led by Mr. Tilden and by Mr. Cleveland, each of whom encountered the same line of argufication which is now used by republicans to defend the accretions of nearly fifty years, expressed for the most part in offices and abuses. The public service is afflicted with bone-felon. Shall the finger be lanced and cured, or shall we allow the disease to continue to burrow below the surface until nothing will save the body politic but the amputation of the hand?

This is the problem for the voters to consider. Forbidden by the organs of the rich—making common cause with the predatory rich—to see the truth and to consider the actualities of the political situation—huddled too often in camps by short-sighted employers, who tell them their wages depend upon how they vote—the outlook for sound opinions and just conclusions here in the east is not encouraging. Yet New York lives and thrives off the west and south, whilst it is to the interest of all the people that the politicians at Washington shall not become so entrenched in power—so unmindful of their origin and obligations—that nothing short of a revolution will be able to remove them.—H. W. in Courier-Journal.

Manhattan Club, Aug., 1908.

ORANGE CROP SHORT

Te Florida special correspondent of the New York Packer says:

The orange crop throughout the Pinellas peninsula will be very short. Grapefruit will make a much better showing as to quantity, yet that will be somewhat short of a full crop. However, the quality seems from present indications much above the average. In fact, some growers claim the finest quality in the history of orange and grapefruit culture. There are not as many russets as usual and the fruit, which is in many groves, groves nearly full grown, is smooth, thin skinned and clean. None, of course, has commenced to ripen as yet, but is as green as the leaves.

Largo is one of the finest and largest citrus fruit producing sections in Florida, and by far the leading shipping point on the Pinellas peninsula. Two years ago Largo shipped about 144,000 boxes of oranges, grapefruit and lemons. Last season this was cut down to about 86,000 boxes, and it is expected about the latter amount will be reached this year. The quality is much better this season than last as the fruit is of early spring bloom,

while last year there was much fruit from the late May and June bloom, which for reasons unknown did not appear this season. Largo has some fine land surrounding in all directions, fine homes and some fine people, but has always needed a hotel which it never had, but will have before the next orange season in November, and this will be a good hotel, as F. M. Campbell is building it and Mrs. Campbell has the reputation of doing things well and up to date. This house will not be large but will be neat, with all modern improvements. Workmen are now busy preparing the foundation and hereafter the orange buyers, the commission man and even the Packer man may stop at Largo while doing business there. F. M. Campbell is an old and appreciative reader of the Packer, is the leading dealer in this section in grain, feed and fertilizers, and one of the largest and most up to date orange growers in Florida. One of Mr. Campbell's orange groves is particularly worthy of mention. This grove dates away back before the memorable freeze of 1895 and the trees are nearly as large as the average forest oak, and have a fine crop of oranges this season, in fact, a full crop, which is unusual this year.

Rabies and Hydrophobia

It is called rabies in the dog and lower animals and hydrophobia in man.

Mad dogs and the effects of their bite on human beings was talked about and written about a great many years before the real nature of the disease was seriously considered. Germany took the initiative by making a law requiring all dogs to be muzzled. This was in 1875. Rabies became rapidly less each year thereafter, and not one case has been reported in Berlin in the past twenty-five years.

But the greatest honor is due to Pasteur, who first scientifically studied the disease in Paris, because he not only produced rabies artificially by injecting rabid saliva, etc., into healthy dogs, cats, rabbits and other lower animals, but he also evolved a harmless, ingenious and very successful plan of treatment out of his experiments.

Symptoms of Rabies in Dogs

There is a change in the disposition or general behavior of the dog. A naturally playful dog becomes sullen and irritable, or if he is naturally quiet, he becomes affectionate, but still obeys his master's command. The bark changes to a combined howl and whine. Irritability increases for two or three days. Shows difficulty of swallowing and eats sticks, wood, etc. He hides away in his kennel or under the house or actually leaves home, and on returning is exhausted and shows signs of having fought. His fighting is peculiar in that he is not noisy as all other dogs are while fighting. His lower jaw hangs loose, he can not swallow, the legs become paralyzed and the animal passes into the dumb stage which just precedes death. The whole course of the disease from onset of first symptoms to death lasts not over a week.

Some cases of rabies begin with paralysis, hiding under the house and inability to swallow, and die quickly—as early as the second or third day. These cases are very rare.

For a dog to recover from rabies is almost unheard of. What should be done with a suspicious dog?

Send for a competent veterinarian and also notify the Board of Health. Don't kill the dog. Lose no time but proceed to shut the dog up or tie him with a chain or a piece of bale wire in a comfortable place, where he may be fed, watered and watched carefully for a week or ten days. If this is not done promptly, the dog may escape and the knowledge that a mad dog is at large will produce a panic in the vicinity. If the veterinarian decides that the animal has rabies, he can be killed and the head expressed to a laboratory for examination. A valuable dog need not be destroyed simply because it bit some one. Biting is a dog's natural and instinctive means of defense. Moreover a dog killed early in the disease does not show the evidence of rabies—the Negri bodies—in the brain and cord very satisfactorily to the laboratory microscopist. The laboratory experts, then, to be on the safe side, must inject rabbits with bits of this suspected dog's brain and spinal cord. It takes at least fourteen days for this injection to produce rabies in the rabbits. During this time the bitten person is in suspense even though he is taking the Pasteur treatment.

The period of incubation, i. e., from the time of bite to appearance of first symptoms is from fifteen to ninety days. Longer and shorter periods of incubation are on record, but they happen rarely.

Dog days have no particular bearing on the disease. Records in the Department of Animal Industry show its prevalence to be independent of season, temperature or locality.

Black mouth or tongue is a fallacious sign, since many dogs have naturally very dark mouths.

Fear of water does not always exist in rabid animals. He may cross it or lie down in it, in fact, but his inability to swallow makes him sooner or later avoid it as it increases his sufferings.

Madstones are of no value. A madstone may "stick" to the wound made by the dog and the individual so treated may never develop hydrophobia, but it counts for nothing. Quite the reverse, the bitten person results in a false sense of security and should the disease develop at the end of period of incubation, a cure is then impossible, whereas the treatment if taken in time, is one of the triumphs of the age.

Summary

Symptoms of rabies: 1st, change of disposition. 2nd, change of voice. 3rd, inability to swallow. 4th, leaving home and returning exhausted and emaciated. 5th, paralysis (drooping) of jaw. 6th, swallowing abnormal substances, as wood, stones, etc.

What to do if a dog is suspicious: Notify Board of Health or Mayor and tie the dog in a comfortable place with a piece of bale wire or chain.

Free use of Florida Health Notes has been made in preparing this article.

(Signed)

City Board of Health.

HER ERROR

"I'd rather wait than eat," confessed the summer girl.

"Then we'll just have another dance instead of going to that fashionable restaurant," responded the thrifty swain. "And," he added mentally, "that's six dollars saved."

CANNED ORATORY

"No need for that pitcher of ice water."

"Why not?"

"The speech tonight is to be delivered by a graphophone."

"I forgot about that. I'll get a little machine oil."

Mr. A. Y. Strunk is back from Washington, where he has been for several months. We understand that he was much benefited by the trip.